

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1 to 20 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1 to 3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 to 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0005137 ("Horie '137"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113596 ("Horie '596"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,286,363 ("Discenzo"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the merits of this rejection, but to facilitate prosecution, claim 1 has been amended herein without prejudice as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A potentiometric sensor device for measuring pH value, comprising:
 - a substrate;
 - two electrodes positioned on the substrate, wherein the two electrodes are applied with the aid of thick film technology, and wherein the two electrodes form an interdigital comb structure; and
 - an evaluation circuit disposed on the substrate and in communication with the electrodes, the evaluation circuit configured to detect a degradation process of a motor oil based on the potentiometric response of the two electrodes and to ascertain a water content of the motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium.

Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 8, line 32 to page 9, line 4 of the Specification.

Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo, alone or in combination, do not disclose or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil

using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

As indicated above, The combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not disclose, or even suggest all of the features of claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not render unpatentable claim 1 or claims 2 and 3, which ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 4 to 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 to 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and U.S. Patent No. 5,904,987 ("Tani et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4 to 6 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1. Tani et al. is not relied upon for disclosing the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. Indeed, Tani et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. In particular, Tani et al. also does not disclose, or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of the any of claims 4 to 6. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. does not render unpatentable any of claims 4 to 6. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,320,735 ("Kato et al.") and U.S. Patent No. 5,126,034 ("Carter et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., and Carter et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 7 and 8 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1. Kato et al. and Carter et al. are not relied upon for disclosing the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. Indeed, Kato et al. and Carter et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. In particular, Kato et al. and Carter et al. also do not disclose, or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., Kato et al., and Carter et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of either of claims 7 and 8. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., Kato et al., and Carter et al. does not render unpatentable either of claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 9 to 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and U.S. Patent No. 3,843,400 ("Radford et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Radford et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 9 to 13 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1. Radford et al. is not relied upon for disclosing the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. Indeed, Radford et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. In particular, Radford et al. also does not disclose, or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Radford et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of any of claims 9 to 13. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Radford et al. does not render unpatentable any of claims 9 to 13. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 14 to 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,582,589 ("Ushizawa et al."), and U.S. Patent No. 5,522,980 ("Hobbs et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Ushizawa et al., and Hobbs et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 14 to 19 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features of claim 1. As indicated above, the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 1. Ushizawa et al. and Hobbs et al. are not relied upon for disclosing the features of claim 1 not disclosed by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. Indeed Ushizawa et al. and Hobbs et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Tani et al. In particular,

Ushiwaza et al. and Hobbs et al. also do not disclose, or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., Ushizawa et al., and Hobbs et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of any of claims 14 to 19. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, Tani et al., Ushizawa et al., and Hobbs et al. does not render unpatentable any of claims 14 to 19. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and U.S. Patent 1,956,741 ("Hornberger"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Hornberger does not render unpatentable claim 20 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 1. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1. Hornberger is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 1 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. Indeed, Hornberger does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 20 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, and Discenzo. In particular, Hornberger also does not disclose, or even suggest, an evaluation circuit configured to ascertain a water content of a motor oil as a function of measured temperature values of the motor oil using characteristic curves stored in a data storage medium, as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Hornberger does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 20. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Horie '137, Horie '596, Discenzo, and Hornberger does not

render unpatentable claim 20. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Clifford A. Ulrich/

Date: January 10, 2011

By Clifford A. Ulrich (Reg. No. 42,194) for:
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,852)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646